HUMAN EVENTS

Volume XIII, No. 4 Saturday, January 28, 1956 Washington, D. C.

News Section *Printed in Two Sections*

Man of the Week: "Knowland has crossed the Rubicon" is one frequent comment today, as the Capital seeks to digest the action of the California Senator in permitting his name to be entered in the Illinois primary. Even cynics express admiration of the Republican who risks his political future by filing in competition with the head of the party. And even cynics admit that Knowland takes his stand on a great constitutional issue.

The issue — as earlier stated in HUMAN EVENTS on December 17 — is this. The American presidency is meant to be responsive to the free choice of the voters; the American two-party system is properly directed by the active voting citizens. These two institutions are not supposed to be directed by government officials and certainly not by non-elected officials who wish to perpetuate themselves in power — now obviously the Palace Guard of Sherman Adams.

The issue — to put it in another way — is whether the voters want a Rooseveltian state run by an *elite*, who manage a part-time President, and who "know what is good for the people" whether the people like it or not. Knowland acts so as to give the American people an opportunity to choose officials who will submit to the electoral verdict instead of yielding to the permanent role of the White House elite.

On December 17, HUMAN EVENTS recommended political action for those who saw the issue in this light — to write to Senators urging support of Knowland's stand on this issue, urging potential favorite son candidates to declare, etc. The response has helped build up sentiment so that the California Senator could take the critical step.

Specifically, Knowland has raised no objection to admirers filing his name as candidate for GOP presidential nomination in the state of Illinois. The Senator remarked that this was in harmony with President Eisenhower's recommendation in his letter to the New Hampshire Secretary of State last week. Ike urged that all Republicans should have a chance to express their preference for the presidential candidate of their choice. Knowland makes no secret of his belief that Ike will not run. However, in case the President does run, the Senator will support him and withdraw from the nomination race.

As a testing ground, Illinois may not be a bad place for the Senator to try the temperature of the water. It is recognized that a considerable rank and file revolt of the GOP has been going on there since 1954. In that year, White House domination of the GOP Senatorial campaign resulted in much dissatisfaction — signalized in some places by "stay-at-home" voters, in others by actual voting for the Democrat by old GOP voters as a rebuke to this domination. Political observers have predicted that Illinois — even more than neighboring, independent Wisconsin — offers more tinder to political ignition this year than previously.

Knowland, of course, risks a "clobbering" by the national party organization. But opinion here is that the Californian stands a better chance of survival for the reason that he will be "in on the ground floor," in the presidential primaries soon commencing, if Ike does not run.

That Will-He-Run Question: "President Eisenhower's attitude yesterday was more like that of Mr. Truman's [in '52] than Mr. Roosevelt's," writes Edward T. Folliard, veteran reporter of the *Washington Post* (January 26), referring to Ike's press conference of the day before. Folliard says the President's attitude was "relaxed, at times jolly," and showed no irritation at the questions about his political future. The *Post* man recalls that Franklin D. Roosevelt "used to resent questions about a third term." Roosevelt played hide-

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1956 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and-seek for many months in 1940 as to whether he would run for a third term or not. Folliard recalls that Harry S. Truman seemed to enjoy "fencing with reporters about the plans for '52, knowing all the time [as they did not] that he planned to retire."

Growth of a (Red) Party Line: HUMAN EVENTS last week described the campaign of the Communist *Daily Worker* against Senator James O. Eastland of Mississippi, and warned that it might presage another McCarthy-type battle for censure. Now, the campaign gathers momentum and the clan called "liberal" rallies its forces. The Louisville *Courier-Journal*, the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch*, and Americans for Democratic Action add their voices to the clamor; the to-have-been anticipated telegram demanding Senate action against Eastland appears over the signatures of "37 prominent Americans." The *Daily Worker* cheers lustily.

The Louisville and St. Louis papers base their attacks on the fact that Eastland has the courage to have the Senate Internal Security Sub-committee, of which he is chairman, look into long-bruited rumors of the presence on the staff of the *New York Times* of an inordinate number of Communists and ex-Communists; most of them turn out to have been ex-. The *Post-Dispatch* accompanies its denunciation with a cartoon titled "Out of the Discard," picturing a dragon-like monstrosity with a heavy-jowled, bearded McCarthy face, front legs labeled "Eastland" and rear legs "Jenner."

The *ADA World* decries the Senate's decision to grant $285,000 to Eastland's sub-committee for operating expenses, saying "No man in the Senate — not even McCarthy — had done more to subvert Constitutional government in the United States than James O. Eastland." Its attack is based on both the *Times* inquiry and Eastland's forthright support of segregation.

The telegram, calling for "appropriate action immediately," denounces "the recent spectacle staged by Sen. Eastland to attack the *New York Times*" as well as "baseless attacks upon the Supreme Court" and what it calls participation in "racist incitement and in the founding of a modern Klan organization." (Eastland's frankly-spoken opinion that the Supreme Court, in the school de-segregation decision, indulged in legislation by judicial fiat, is concurred in by many leading attorneys, northern as well as southern.) Signers of the telegram include such "liberals" as radio commentator Elmer Davis, theologian Reinhold Niebuhr and AFL Vice President A. Philip Randolph.

All this causes the *Daily Worker* to ecstasiate in an editorial titled "Un-American Symbol." "These developments," it crows, "can only mean one thing. There is a growing realization that federal indifference to Eastland and other political racists is a disservice to America — that Eastland should be expelled from the Senate."

The real danger — say veterans who have watched similar developments — is that many may fall for the phoney idea that the big reason for attacks on Eastland is his segregation stand. That's sheer window-dressing. Many other prominent Southerners — it is pointed out — are fully as vehement and adamant in opposing integration as Eastland; they, however, have neither the opportunity nor the inclination to fight Communism as he has been doing — they are not subjected to the same concentrated attack. The campaign a-building against Eastland — it is now agreed — is a repetition of similar campaigns in the past to destroy every legislator who has taken a lead in fighting the Red conspiracy — McCarthy, McCarran, Nixon, Walter, John Wood, Dies and others; the underlying issue is his anti-Communism, not his segregationism.

Bowie: Another Bohlen? Robert R. Bowie, chief of the State Department's Policy Planning Staff who has been nominated for title and rank of Assistant Secretary, faces rough going in a scheduled appearance before Senate Foreign Relations Committee next week. Two top Senate Republicans — Floor Leader William F. Knowland of California and Policy Committee Chairman Styles Bridges of New Hampshire — have told Secretary John Foster Dulles in no uncertain terms they do not like the nomination.

Reason for their opposition lies in Bowie's reported views on what American foreign policy should be — views diametrically opposed in some instances to those of the Republican Administra-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion and of Knowland and Bridges in particular. Bowie apparently eschews public statements or speeches; but colleagues say that in private conversations, even at social affairs, he makes no bones of his feeling that Red China must be recognized and admitted to the community of nations; that Nehru and his stooge Krishna Menon are pretty good guys although slightly misled at times; that the U.S. would do well to team up with India; and that the United Nations is something sacrosanct which should not be criticized in any way. Knowland, a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, is primed to ask about his opinions.

The Senators contend that in 1953, as a result of the fight over choice of Charles E. "Chip" Bohlen to be U.S. Ambassador to Moscow, Dulles agreed to consult Republican Senators before submitting diplomatic nominations in the future. (Eleven Republicans joined two Democrats in voting against Bohlen's confirmation, which carried 74 to 13.) The Bowie nomination went to the Capitol without any warning to top Senate leaders; Bridges and Knowland invited Dulles to lunch in the latter's Capitol office, read him the riot act in an acrimonious, table-pounding session, urged him to withdraw the nomination. Dulles defended his aide, admitted that some of his views were not those of the Administration but said he could control his official's actions and refused to withdraw the name.

Natural Gas Bill: The conservative side of the developing debate over the natural gas bill — designed to exempt producers of natural gas from utility regulations by the Federal Power Commission — was well presented by Senator Styles Bridges, Republican of New Hampshire. "If the Federal government can regulate the price of gas at the well head, it can regulate the price of any other fuel, of any agricultural or manufactured commodity," said the New Hampshire Senator.

"It could even regulate," continued Bridges, "the cutting price of timber on a small wood lot in New Hampshire. I could hardly be guilty of exaggeration when I say that a New Hampshire farmer raising chickens for the Boston market could have his price laid down by Washington under such a statute. Do you want that kind of America? I, for one, do not."

The outcome of the fight over this bill remains highly uncertain — as seen from this date. The bill passed the House by only a small margin last session. The socialists (of whom Senator Douglas is the mouthpiece) have spread their propaganda widely and have taken in many non-socialists. Local business interests in many places, also affected by the collectivist ballyhoo, have rallied against the bill. A determined effort by New Dealers in the Senate to pass crippling amendments to the measure is expected in the coming week. An aroused public opinion at home, however, can sway the votes of many Senators now on the fence. (For an extended and illuminating plea in favor of the bill, see the pamphlet, "Will Congress Allow Supreme Court's Decision to Make Gas a Dwindling Fuel?" by the Hon. Samuel B. Pettengill [contributor to HUMAN EVENTS], distributed by the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., 205 East 42nd Street, New York 17, N. Y.)

Letter from MORTON BODFISH, Chairman, First Federal Savings and Loan Association of Chicago: "I consider HUMAN EVENTS an eloquent advocate for the preservation of our constitutional form of government and the traditional conservatism that has made America great."

Republican Liberalism: Senators Byrd (D., Va.) and Bridges (R., N. H.) this week proposed a constitutional amendment to require a balanced budget every year except in time of war or national emergency. It would require the President to submit at the start of each session a budget in which recommended expenditures could not exceed estimated receipts.

When two conservatives of both parties offer such a measure to remedy the spending malady, observers on Capitol Hill find it very symptomatic of the strong undercurrent of alarm at the President's "spend and elect" budget and other indications that the Administration and its party have cast aside all previous professions of government economy and fiscal soundness.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Hence, many Republicans here feel that the jibes of political cynics of years past — who said the Republicans had no fundamental objections to the New and Fair Deals, but only wanted office to run them "better" — were all too justified. It is recalled now that Albert Jay Nock, conservative philosopher and author of *Our Enemy the State,* early in the Roosevelt era predicted the state of things in which GOP "liberals" now glory. In a book, *Journal of Forgotten Days — 1934-1935,* Nock comments on the then developing Roosevelt collectivism and notes signs that the Republicans would accept the trend and try to capture it. Under date of December 6, 1934, Nock remarked that Borah and other GOP leaders were following this trend. "Great talk of 'liberalizing' the Republican Party. . . . This means simply that the New Deal is here to stay, as a permanent resource of waste and theft, and that the Republican Party is by way of reorganizing to compete for the management of it. In other words, it means that the Republican politicians smell money, and want to garner it in."

All this is not merely regrettable "water over the dam," not merely to be deplored and discounted — say some practical politicians. The rock-ribbed conservatives who have been the backbone of the GOP traditionally do not like the GOP "liberal" brand of economics — insist these politicos. They are quite numerous enough to contribute to the defeat of the GOP national ticket next fall, if the "liberals" of the party defy them to stay home — and they angrily accept the challenge.

Straw in the Aid-to-Education Wind: With a bitter House battle approaching on Federal aid to education legislation, "educationists" lay the ground-work for the next round in their overall effort to shift responsibility for financing of the nation's schools to the Federal treasury. A meeting of the Committee for the White House Conference on Education broke up with the announcement that it has decided to ask President Eisenhower to call another session comparable to December's controversial Conference, this one to discuss Federal aid to higher education — to the nation's colleges and universities. It follows a pattern; "educationists" figure they have built up the basic "Federal aid" bill to a point where passage is only a matter of time, and now can afford to divert a bit of energy to preparing for the next phase.

It took roughly two years of build-up and planning to bring about last December's White House Conference on Education; because of experience with it, the next one may not take as long. Presumably it would be conducted on the same "group dynamics" procedure as was the December parley; a huge number of delegates brought in, laymen in the majority but fading out of the picture as the Conference progresses and "educationists" take over the final stages, including writing of ultimate reports; no vote on anything, simply a bland announcement (challenged by many) that conference delegates favor this or that by 2 to 1.

Talks with individuals, who were delegates in December cast an extremely dubious light on the statement that the Conference favored Federal aid, even in limited form, by a 2 to 1 majority; it is more likely that any actual poll of all 1,700 delegates might show a majority against Federal aid, particularly a poll of lay delegates as contrasted with "educationists" — teachers, school board officials, school organization attaches, etc.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 6 weeks for $1.

Yearly rate, $10; *6 months,* $6; *3 months,* $3.

By first class mail, $12 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $14 a year. FOREIGN: by regular mail, $13 a year; airmail, $18.

Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.

1955 Bound Annual Volume with complete Index $15. All Bound Volumes for years prior to 1955 have been sold.

The Declaration of Independence opens: "When in the course of HUMAN EVENTS . . ."

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher* JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*

Contributing Editors: FRANK CHODOROV, WILLIS J. BALLINGER

HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D.C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Entered as second class matter at Washington, D.C. Copyright 1956.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Volume XIII, No. 4 HUMAN EVENTS January 28, 1956

Article Section

INDIA — NEUTRAL AGAINST WHOM?

By FREDA UTLEY

On January 17 Senator Knowland said:

> **"Can our economic system survive prolonged burdens of building a system of collective security and a system of neutralism at one and the same time? . . . If the neutralists are to receive the benefits and have none of the responsibilities of those in the collective defense system, will not this act as an incentive plan to build up the fence sitters?"**

India, to whom we have sent half a billion dollars of unrequested aid in gifts and loans, is the prime example of our futile and dangerous policy of being equally, or more generous to "neutrals" than to proven allies. This policy, as the California Senator also warned, will be reappraised "on the main streets of America" if the Executive and Congress fail to abandon it. Let us leave aside the fact that India, whose Congress Party is dedicated to the nationalization of basic industries, has so discouraged private investment that General Motors and Ford have suspended their Indian manufacturing activities. Let us consider only the political consequences of our self-defeating foreign aid policy.

The triumphant, flower-strewn progress of Messrs. Bulganin and Khrushchev during their recent visit to India has proved that Nehru's land is no longer even neutral, but the friend of our enemies. This has begun to be realized by the British press, if not yet by the American public and government.

Newspapers such as the "liberal" *Manchester Guardian,* together with the London *Times* (whose enthusiasm for peaceful coexistence with the Communist totalitarian tyrannies has matched its former advocacy of an understanding with Nazi Germany), have been equally perturbed by the evidence that the Soviet Empire is as hostile to Britain as to the United States. In the words of the consistently anti-Communist *Spectator,* there was such "panic" at Khrushchev's diatribes against British imperialism, that "even the *Manchester Guardian* and the *Times* were impelled, on the same day, to publish leading articles in which the liberal conscience could be seen chasing its tail over the sins of our fathers who were not sufficiently brotherly toward their colonial subjects."

According to Taya Zinkin, the able and witty correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian* in India, Nehru's attitude toward his excessively honored guests, was like that of an "eager mother presenting her daughter and straightening a last strand of hair before the curtsy." As she also reported from New Delhi on November 18, "The visit to India of the Russian leaders marks a decisive phase of Indo-British relations: it is the end of the honeymoon."

SINCE THE BRITISH worm is turning, maybe it is not too much to hope that the most patient of all beasts of burden, the American taxpayer, may begin to ask what is the sense of giving economic aid to an India whose President on November 18 proclaimed that his country and Communist Russia "are very close to each other," and that "every day the bonds of friendship between the Soviet world and India are being further strengthened."

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1956 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Nehru's and U-Nu's methods of enforcing "popular enthusiasm" for the Communist leaders smacked of the totalitarian compulsions employed in the USSR to ensure attendance at mass demonstrations. According to the London *Economist,* in both India and Burma the well-rehearsed, cheering, slogan-shouting school children lined the route by order. As one Indian newspaper, the Madras *Mail,* had the courage to point out, "What could not have been done in ten years indoctrination [of the future young voters of India] may have been achieved in one red-letter day" — at the instance of the Indian government. A note of humor is added by the report from Burma, where the children shouted their pro-Soviet slogans off pieces of paper supplied by the authorities, that a Western newspaper correspondent had no difficulty in also getting them to chant obediently, "Long Live Dulles" and "Long Live Coca-Cola." What is most ominous is that Communism has been made to appear respectable and admirable, and the West odious in the eyes of the masses, by the deliberate action of the governments of India and Burma.

As was to be expected, we have our own powerful voices in the American press, and on radio and television, telling us that we should not be deterred from aiding India simply because Nehru loves Russia; or because he has learned from his totalitarian friends in Moscow and Peking how to force or bribe his people to parade and shout and strew flowers, or otherwise express their master's voice in paying enthusiastic tribute to the rulers of the Soviet Empire. But it would be worse than folly for us to listen to their voices. We had far better take cognizance of the still, small voice of our friends in Asia who tell us that appeasement is not the road to peace, and that the surest way of bringing on a third world war is to continue our present policy of disheartening our friends and convincing the world that only the Communists need to be feared and conciliated.

There is need for us to be generous, but let's decide, intelligently, to give our aid and support only to those prepared to share with us the heat and burden of the day in the world-wide struggle against the Communist menace. Who, in his senses, can advocate that we continue, unconditionally, to aid India which, under Nehru, has definitely proclaimed itself "neutral" against us? Why should we be generous to such friends of our enemies as Nehru and Tito, and so niggardly to proven allies such as Chiang Kai-shek, Syngman Rhee and Turkey, who are finding it increasingly difficult to stem the dangerous tide of inflation caused by their exposed position, uncompromising hostility to Communist imperialism and consequent need to maintain armies beyond their strength.

If it was wise to promise dollar aid to Nasser to build the Aswan dam in Egypt, why should we have waited to do so until he had threatened us with securing Russian — probably mythical — help? Why should we teach the world that the easiest way to get American aid is to threaten us by establishing economic, military or political relations with our enemies; and the most likely way to ensure America's rejection of support is to be loyal to us? Why should we continue to pour out our wealth for no purpose except to make our actual and political enemies believe us to be so weak that we need to resort to bribery, and cause our friends to despair of our resolution to resist their enemies and ours? In a word, trying to buy friendship or ward off enmity with dollars is equivalent to building the edifice of our security on sand.

"ALL THE AMERICAN billions poured into Europe since the war, with their immense beneficial effect, have only made America more hated than ever."

This extreme and questionable verdict was not pronounced by an unreconstructed American isolationist. It is to be found in a remarkable book published in Calcutta and called, *Blowing Up India.* The author,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Philip Spratt, is an expatriate Englishman who chose India as his country and an Indian woman as his wife, a quarter of a century ago, after spending several years in British prisons because of his revolutionary activities. As an old-vintage ex-Communist, he is mainly concerned in awakening his adopted country to the real and present danger emanating from Peking and Moscow; in trying to cure them of their neurotic complexes about a no-longer-existent "Western imperialism;" and, in demonstrating that there is no valid basis for their belief that America "being a capitalist power, must try to establish an Empire and take over India from the British."

Philip Spratt tells us frankly that all our generosity will avail us nought in this world. The richer countries, he thinks, ought to aid the poorer, but they should have no illusions that this will stop Communism since "the main drive of the Russo-Chinese leaders is for military power." China, he writes, "will soon have a standing army of 20 million and a little more rice is no answer to that." With old-time British realism, he concludes:

> **"In twenty years Russo-China will possess unchallengeable military superiority to the rest of the world. . . . All they will (then) need to do is to address ultimata to other countries to compel them to submit on pain of extinction. . . . The idea that China can be bought out of the alliance by trade or loans is childish. The Chinese Communists are not nationalists. . . . If we continue to make conquest easy for them, there is no reason why (Moscow and Peking) should quarrel; they will go happily ahead to their glorious destiny of ruling the world, and will postpone the question who is to be the eventual boss till it arises."**

Thus, he concludes, as every rational American also should, that the only hope of promoting a split between Russia and China is to put up the stiffest possible resistance to the latter's aggression.

SIMILARLY, with regard to India, Philip Spratt tells us, in words reminiscent of Senator Knowland, that our Asiatic policy amounts to one of "gradual surrender" which demoralizes the people on our side. There are, he writes, many Indians who are sufficiently realistic and informed to know that "without American support, free Asia is doomed," and who realize that there is "no reason to doubt" our good intentions because "the interests of America coincide with those of the free Asian countries." But, he continues, there has been a revulsion against us even among our best friends in India, on account of our "painfully weak" policy.

He cites, in particular, our shabby and stupid treatment of Chiang Kai-shek whom we "secretly undermined," prevented from "pressing his advantage and finishing off the Communists, when he seemed likely to do so;" and to whom we "cut off arms aid when he began to lose." Similarly with regard to Korea, he reproaches America for having "weakly allowed herself to be dissuaded by the neutralists and faint-hearts in the UN" to conclude an armistice at the moment when we had obtained military supremacy and "were in a position to drive the Chinese out of the peninsula and unite Korea." Thus we not only restored "the explosive *status quo* in Korea," but also "enabled Communist China to claim the advantage in the military exchanges and consequently to obtain an enormous accession of prestige."

All these blunders have naturally disheartened our erstwhile Indian friends who now "tend to fall into line with the easy, popular neutralism." Hence, the ever increasing influence of Nehru's evil genius, and representative in the UN, Mr. Krishna Menon, whom Spratt describes as belonging to "that considerable band of people in important positions in the free world who, though not technically party members, are in fact disciplined Communists."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Even if this is disputed, there is indeed "something anomalous in a convinced partisan of the aggressor masquerading as a neutral mediator."

As regards Nehru himself, Spratt does not think that he is "deliberately working for the Communists," although he sometimes fears it in view of the fact that, "with scarcely an exception, he has exerted his considerable influence on the Communist side." Nehru reminds Philip Spratt of Franklin D. Roosevelt. He characterizes them both as consistent democrats at home and consistently pro-Communist in world affairs." He suggests as the explanation not only FDR's and Nehru's "kindergarten innocence about Communism," but other shared characteristics, such as their "passion for applause, excessive confidence in their own judgment, a certain failure of intellectual effort," and "an unwillingness to think things out and to grapple with harsh realities." He considers that whatever Nehru's subjective motives may be, objectively he is leading India "rapidly and almost unresistingly into — or at least dangerously near — the Soviet bloc."

This book was written after Nehru had pronounced his enthusiastic eulogy of Stalin after the dictator's death, but before he embraced Bulganin and Khrushchev. After reading it, one wonders why the State Department or the U.S. Information Services do not devote a few thousand dollars to promoting its sale all over Asia and Europe, and in furnishing copies to all our libraries abroad. It would also be extremely useful if it were published and widely read in America instead of being available only in a paper backed edition published in Calcutta.* Surely money thus expended would avail us infinitely more than some tons of rice given to feed the inexhaustible hunger of India's millions.

* Published by The Society for Defense of Freedom in Asia. Sita Ram Goel; Prachi Prakashan, 12 Chowring Lee Square. Calcutta. Price abroad U.S. 50¢.

WHAT is the solution to our dilemma? Perhaps the London *Economist* has the answer. In its issue of December 17, it advocated our calling Soviet Russia's bluff by welcoming Moscow's proclaimed readiness to take on its "fair share of the job of aiding poorer countries."

"How long," says the *Economist,* in an editorial entitled "The Happy Hypocrites," "will it take for Soviet aid to become taken for granted, for Asian recipients to fret at its nakedly bilateral and choosey forms and urge Moscow, as they have urged the West, to channel it through multilateral systems such as UN and the Colombo plan?"

In a word, why should we worry because the Kremlin has chosen to meet us on our own ground? "If Russian economic offers are of a kind that helps them [Asian recipients] to avert difficulty and disorder, as Western aid does, so much the better." As the *Economist* implies, if Russian economic aid proves to be a myth and a delusion, so much the better for the free world. Meanwhile, why don't we give aid and comfort to our proved and loyal friends, and let India enjoy the doubtful blessings of friendship with our enemies the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and its younger brother the "People's Government" of China?

In a word, let the Communists and their friends stew happily in their own juice, while we help those who can be counted upon to stand by us in spite of all the threats and blandishments of Moscow and Peking.

Additional copies of this 4-page Article: 6 for $1; 10 for $1.50; 50 for $5.50; 100 for $10; 500 for $20; 1,000 for $30. In quantities of 5,000 or more, $20 per thousand.

FREDA UTLEY is the author of *The China Story* (Regnery, 1951) and has been a frequent contributor to HUMAN EVENTS (see her "Truce of the Bear," May 21, 1955).

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $10 per year.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS for new subscribers only: 6 weeks for $1.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED